



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

quent in payment of taxes, and a tax deed was issued to the county, which conveyed to defendant's grantor. Thereafter plaintiff paid all the taxes and after seven years brought suit to clear his title. By statute, one "having color of title made in good faith to vacant and unoccupied lands" shall, having paid taxes seven years, be deemed the owner (1915 REM. CODE, [Wash.] § 789). *Held*, that plaintiff had color of title, and judgment should therefore be in his favor. *Bassett v. City of Spokane*, 168 Pac. 478 (Wash.).

It seems settled that if the writing under which color of title is claimed is adjudicated void in an action to which the claimant is a party, he no longer holds under color of title within the meaning of the short limitation statutes. *May v. Sutherlin*, 41 Wash. 609, 84 Pac. 585; *Sholl v. German Coal Co.*, 139 Ill. 21, 28 N. E. 748. It has also been held that color of title is divested by a sale of the land on execution. *Wilson v. Brown*, 134 N. C. 400, 46 S. E. 762. But where the claimant continues to hold the land believing the sale invalid, it is not divested. *Gaines v. Saunders*, 87 Mo. 557. The theory underlying these decisions would seem to be that color of title remains, but that an adjudication or sheriff's sale is *prima facie* evidence that the claimant does not hold in good faith. The test of good faith is subjective. *Lee v. O'Quinn*, 103 Ga. 355, 30 S. E. 356. Therefore the *prima facie* case made out by the decree or sale is rebuttable by any proof that the claimant believed his deed was still valid, however unreasonably. *Gaines v. Saunders, supra*. In the May case, where the decision was expressly based on want of good faith, the court seems to have thought the decree made out a conclusive case, but as there was no rebutting evidence of good faith it cannot be taken as an authority to that effect. *May v. Sutherlin, supra*. So the distinction made in the principal case between *in personam* adjudications of title and judgments *in rem*, which seems to have no basis on principle, is not borne out by the decisions. In the principal case good faith was not in issue, but if it had been, then under this view plaintiff must have affirmatively proved good faith in order to prevail.

CONFlict OF LAW — EQUITY — ORDERING AFFIRMATIVE ACTION OUTSIDE THE JURISDICTION TO PREVENT A TORT WITHIN. — In a case involving the respective rights of the plaintiff and the defendant to water from an interstate stream, the United States District Court of Idaho ordered the defendant to install automatic measuring devices in its irrigation ditches in Nevada, and decreed that the plaintiff should have the right perpetually to go upon the defendant's land in Nevada for the purpose of inspecting them. An appeal was taken to the Circuit Court of Appeals. *Held*, that the action of the District Court be sustained. *Vineyard Land and Stock Co. v. Twin Falls Salmon River Land and Water Co.*, 245 Fed. 9.

For a discussion of this case, see Notes, page 647.

CONSIDERATION — WHAT CONSTITUTES CONSIDERATION — PERFORMANCE OF A PREEXISTING CONTRACT. — The daughter of the defendant was engaged to be married. The defendant promised her intended husband, that, if the marriage took place, he would pay his daughter an annuity. They were married, and the assignee of the husband and wife sued on the promise. *Held*, that he may recover. *De Cicco v. Sweitzer*, 58 N. Y. L. J. 633.

The finding by the lower court of an intent to contract removes the possibility of a conditional gift. See *Kirksey v. Kirksey*, 8 Ala. 131. The beneficiary has the right to sue in New York. *Lawrence v. Fox*, 20 N. Y. 268; *Buchanan v. Tilden*, 158 N. Y. 109, 52 N. E. 724. The question in the case is the validity of the consideration. An act which the promisee is legally bound to perform is not valid consideration for the promise of a third person. *Arend v. Smith*, 151 N. Y. 502, 45 N. E. 872. But see Samuel Williston, "Consideration in Bilateral Contracts," 27 HARV. L. REV. 503. However, in the present case the act